

## REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 19, 2007. With the prior cancellation of claims 5, 11-26 and 32-37, and the current cancellation of claim \*\*\*, claims \*\*\* are presented herewith.

### Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 8-10 Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 23, 25, 28, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 58, 60, 66, 68 and 69 of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336 (“the ‘336 Patent”).

### Rejection of Amended Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Amended claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 27 has been amended in a way to overcome this rejection, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

### Rejection of Amended Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Amended claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 27 has been amended in a way to overcome this rejection, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

### Rejection of Amended Claims 27 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Amended claims 27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Amended claims 27 and 30 have been amended in a way to overcome this rejection, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,039,656 to Tsai et al. (hereinafter “Tsai”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,020,704 to Lipscomb et al. (“Lipscomb”).

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai in view of Lipscomb and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0091785 to Ohlenbusch et al. (hereinafter “Ohlenbusch”).

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 4 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai in view of Lipscomb and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,812,961 to Parulski et al. (hereinafter “Parulski”).

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 27-31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047393 to Arner et al. (hereinafter “Arner”) in view of Tsai and “Official Notice”.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 27-31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,850 to Freishtat et al. (hereinafter “Freishtat”) and “Official Notice”.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 27-31 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0093342 to Arbo et al. (hereinafter “Arbo”) in view of “Official Notice”.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner’s prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, September 19, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 19, 2007

By: /Brian I. Marcus/  
Brian I. Marcus  
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665